



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/435,377 05/05/95 CLERON

M P1525/112007

┌

LM51/0816

└

EXAMINER

CESARI AND MCKENNA
30 ROWES WHARF
BOSTON MA 02110

CALDWELL, P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2755

DATE MAILED:

08/16/99

#25

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Interview Summary

Application No.

08/435,377

Applicant(s)

Cleron et al

Examiner

Pat Caldwell

Group Art Unit

2755



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Pat Caldwell(3) Michael Reinemann(2) Alvin Oberley

(4) _____

Date of Interview Aug 12, 1999Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.Claim(s) discussed: None

Identification of prior art discussed:

none

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

This summary is in response to telephone message (8/11/99) and telephone conversations (8/12/99). SPE has thoroughly reviewed the details of this case numerous times. The issues at hand have been detailed in paper items 21 (final rejection), 22 (interview summary), 23 (applicants' request for reconsideration) & 24 (advisory action and attachment). Applicants and Examiners have repeatedly failed to reach agreement regarding the formal sufficiency of declaration under 37 CFR 1.131 (paper item 17). As such, there does not appear to be a need for an additional telephone interview with the Examiner and SPE. MPEP 715.08 recites Applicants' options for review of the 37 CFR 1.131 declaration issue.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

ALVIN E. OBERLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2700

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.